



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,408	09/24/2003	John H. Zybara	MSI-1686U/S	8391
22801	7590	10/12/2010	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES, PLLC			YEN, SYLING	
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1400			2166	
SPOKANE, WA 99201				
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/12/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/671,408	Applicant(s) ZYBURA ET AL.
	Examiner SYLING YEN	Art Unit 2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on **21 July 2010**.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) **1-7, 9-11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, 26-29, 34 and 35** is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) **1-7, 9-11, 13, 15-16, 18, 20, 26-29 and 34-35** is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on July 21, 2010. Claims 8, 12, 14, 17, 19, 21-25 and 30-33 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 13, 18 and 26-28 have been amended. Claims 34-35 have been added. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13, 15-16, 18, 20, 26-29 and 34-35 are pending.
2. Applicants' arguments filed July 21, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2166

4. Claims 1-2, 13, 20, 26 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yellepeddy et al (US Patent Application 2003/0145003 A1, hereinafter, "Yellepeddy").

5. With respect to claim 1,

Yellepeddy discloses a **computer-implemented method, comprising:**
receiving, by a computing device, an indication of a change to data
comprising a reference attribute in a first external object in a first namespace
(Yellepeddy [0040], [0054] and Fig. 1 e.g. a determination is made as to exactly which
attributes are changed by the update operation, and a differential update is propagated
throughout the metadirectory via direct joiner access to the data items, or through
remote access such as through LDAP; and the Joiner receives changes made to a
joined object [as a reference attribute in a first external object] in a directory [as first
name space]), **wherein the reference attribute refers to a second external object in**
the first namespace, the first external object and the second external object each
having an associated central representation in a second namespace (Yellepeddy
[0060] - [0062] and [0064] and Fig. 2-4 e.g. the Joiner merges selected data items, e.g.
first name [as first external object & the reference in the first external object], title, work
telephone from HR database [as first name space] to create an entry in a local table for
Mr. Kent, the multiple local tables of heterogeneous directories, e.g. HR database,
Notes NAB [as third name space], NT Domain Directory [as forth name space] and
NW3.x Bindary [as fifth name space] are combined to create a joined table [as central
representation] which provides a homogenous view [as second/central name space] of

Art Unit: 2166

the joined heterogeneous data), **wherein the second namespace includes a metadirectory that includes all data from each of its associated namespaces** (Yellepeddy [0051] – [0052], [0055], [0057] and Fig. 1 e.g. Turning to FIG. 1, the metadirectory architecture (1) according to the preferred embodiment is shown. The Joiner (10) communicates with connected data sources ("DS"), such as databases (11, 16), either directly or through an Agent (12, 15, 17). It merges entries of the same object type from different data sources together, such as text files (18), records in a database (16, 11), networked data storage items (13), or other remotely accessible data stores, such as LDAP directories (14, 19). The Joiner (10) keeps a copy of the joined data from each data source in a relational database, preferably in a DB2 database. Each object type for each data store is contained in a local table ("LT") (100). As such, the advantages of the Joiner of the preferred embodiment include: (b) all resources in an organization are represented by a Join [as the second namespace includes a metadirectory (e.g. metadirectory architecture (1) in Fig. 1) that includes all data (e.g. each object type) from each of its associated namespaces (e.g. for each data store – text files 18, database 16, network data storage 14 and LDAP directories 14 & 19). As referring to the instant application specification Fig. 4];

evaluating, by the computing device, an association between the central representation of the second external object in the second namespace and the second external object in the first namespace to identify a third external object in a third namespace (Yellepeddy [0054], [0062] and Fig. 1 e.g. the Joiner evaluates the changes, e.g. changes made to the telephone number [as third external object] from

other department, e.g. Notes NAB are valid, and then propagate them to the other directories [as a third namespace]);

discovering, by the computing device, a format of a corresponding reference attribute in the third external object, the reference attribute and corresponding reference attribute having different formats and the format of the corresponding reference attribute being associated with an attribute in the central representation of the second external object (Yellepeddy [0078] – [0081] and Fig. 4 & 8 e.g. When the Joiner receives an update operation (81) for an entry in a directory, it performs an "apply" operation (82) on a selected entry in the metadirectory local table, creating a temporary modified entry containing the result of the update. This temporary modified entry is not written to the secondary storage (e.g. propagated to the other joined directories), however. The modified entry is compared (83) with the original (unmodified) entry to identify the differences between the original entry and the updated entry. If there are differences (84), then a differential update operation is created (86) containing only the changed fields in the entry and omitted the operations which result in no net change to a field. This differential update is then propagated (87) to the other directories in the metadirectory, and the original (unmodified) local copy of the entry is replaced by the temporary (updated) copy of the entry. As each of the content formats of the joined objects and directories of the metadirectory may be in different formats (e.g. NAB, DB2, etc.), in order to implement the differential change to the affected items, different update operations must be executed for different format objects and directories. The differential update is propagated in a common format, preferably

LDAP, and converted to the necessary format of each joined object and directory by the metadirectory agents [as discovering a format (e.g. Notes NAB) of a corresponding reference attribute in the third external object (e.g. changed fields in the entry), the reference attribute and corresponding reference attribute (e.g. the affected items) having different formats (e.g. different format) and the format of the corresponding reference attribute being associated with an attribute in the central representation (e.g. Table Joining 45 of the metadirectory Joiner 10 in Fig. 4) of the second external object (e.g. joined object)]; and

propagating, by the computing device, the changed data to the third namespace to update the third external object (Yellepeddy [0054], [0062] and Fig. 1 e.g. the Joiner propagates the changes, e.g. changes made to the telephone number [as updating the third external object] and home address attributes from other department, to the other directories [as the third namespace] within the metadirectory), the propagating including retrieving a value of the attribute in the central representation of the second object and updating a value of the corresponding reference attribute in the third external object based on the retrieved value (Yellepeddy [0081] and Fig. 4 & 8 e.g. If there are differences (84), then a differential update operation is created (86) containing only the changed fields in the entry and omitted the operations which result in no net change to a field. This differential update is then propagated (87) to the other directories in the metadirectory, and the original (unmodified) local copy of the entry is replaced by the temporary (updated) copy of the entry. As each of the content formats of the joined objects and directories of the

Art Unit: 2166

metadirectory may be in different formats (e.g. NAB, DB2, etc.), in order to implement the differential change to the affected items, different update operations must be executed for different format objects and directories. The differential update is propagated in a common format, preferably LDAP, and converted to the necessary format of each joined object and directory by the metadirectory agents [as the propagating including retrieving a value (e.g. the differential update) of the attribute in the central representation of the second object (e.g. each joined object) and updating a value of the corresponding reference attribute (e.g. the differential update converted to the necessary format) in the third external object (e.g. the affected items) based on the retrieval value (e.g. the differential update)]).

6. With respect to claim 2,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the indication of the change comprises a notice that the reference to the second external object was added, modified, or deleted** (see Yellepeddy [0061], where the metadirectory ("MD") may be a master, slave or peer to the managed data sources, which determines which entities may create, modify and delete data objects).

7. With respect to claim 13,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the central representation comprises an aggregation of all information from the first object and the third object, wherein the first object serves as a first master for at least a first piece of information absent in the third object, and the third object serves as a second master for at least a second piece of information absent in the first object** (Yellepeddy [0051] –

Art Unit: 2166

[0052], [0055], [0057] and Fig. 1 e.g. Turning to FIG. 1, the metadirectory architecture (1) according to the preferred embodiment is shown. The Joiner (10) communicates with connected data sources ("DS"), such as databases (11, 16), either directly or through an Agent (12, 15, 17). It merges entries of the same object type from different data sources together, such as text files (18), records in a database (16, 11), networked data storage items (13), or other remotely accessible data stores, such as LDAP directories (14, 19). The Joiner (10) keeps a copy of the joined data from each data source in a relational database, preferably in a DB2 database. Each object type for each data store is contained in a local table ("LT") (100). As such, the advantages of the Joiner of the preferred embodiment include: (b) all resources in an organization are represented by a Join [as an aggregation (e.g. a join) of all information (e.g. all resources) from the first object and the third object, wherein the first object serves as a first master for at least a first piece of information absent in the third object (e.g. each object type for each data store), and the third object serves as a second master for at least a second piece of information absent in the first object (e.g. each object type for each data store)]; **and**

wherein the format of the reference attribute requires a name of a person represented by the second object and the format of the corresponding reference attribute requires an email alias of the person represented by the second object (Yellepeddy [0054] and Fig. 2 e.g. FIG. 2 further illustrates the Join operation using an example. A human resources database may contain a first entry (22) for an employee "Clark Kent", including his employee number, surname, first name [as a name of a

Art Unit: 2166

person "Clark Kent"], title, work telephone number, department, date of hire, salary, home address, home telephone number, and medical notes. In a Notes Name and Address book ("NAB"), there may be an entry (23) for Mr. Kent containing his user name, user short name, location of his mail server and mail file, and his email address [as the format of the corresponding reference attribute requires an email alias (e.g. his email address) for the person (e.g. Mr. Kent) represented by the second object] for external email to and from the Internet. In an NT domain directory, there may be an entry (24) for Mr. Kent including a UserID, password, ServerID, and list of groups to which he belongs. Further, in a Novellware binary, there may be a user object and one or more routing tables (25) defining how to route messages to and from Mr. Kent.).

8. Concerning claim 20,

The limitations therein have substantially the same scope as claim 8. Therefore claim 20 is rejected for at least the same reasons as claim 8.

9. Concerning claim 26

The limitations therein have substantially the same scope as claim 1 because claim 26 is a computer-readable medium claim for implementing those methods of claim 1. Therefore claim 26 is rejected for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

10. With respect to claim 34,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the first namespace serves as a first master for at least a first piece of information absent in the third namespace, and the third namespace serves as a second master for at least a second piece of information absent in the first namespace** (Yellepeddy [0051] – [0052], [0055],

[0057] and Fig. 1 e.g. Turning to FIG. 1, the metadirectory architecture (1) according to the preferred embodiment is shown. The Joiner (10) communicates with connected data sources ("DS"), such as databases (11, 16), either directly or through an Agent (12, 15, 17). It merges entries of the same object type from different data sources together, such as text files (18), records in a database (16, 11), networked data storage items (13), or other remotely accessible data stores, such as LDAP directories (14, 19). The Joiner (10) keeps a copy of the joined data from each data source in a relational database, preferably in a DB2 database. Each object type for each data store is contained in a local table ("LT") (100). As such, the advantages of the Joiner of the preferred embodiment include: (b) all resources in an organization are represented by a Join [as an aggregation (e.g. a join) of all information (e.g. all resources) from the first object and the third object, wherein the first object serves as a first master for at least a first piece of information absent in the third object (e.g. each object type for each data store), and the third object serves as a second master for at least a second piece of information absent in the first object (e.g. each object type for each data store)]].

11. Concerning claim 35

The limitations therein have substantially the same scope as claim 34 because claim 35 is a system claim for implementing those methods of claim 34. Therefore claim 35 is rejected for at least the same reasons as claim 34.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious by Yellepeddy as applied to claims 1-2, 13, 20, 26 and 34-35 above, and further in view of Thatcher et al (U.S. Patent 6,061,743 hereinafter, "Thatcher").

15. With respect to claim 3,

Although Yellepeddy substantially teaches the claimed invention, Yellepeddy does not explicitly indicate **evaluating correlation information that correlates objects in the first namespace with objects in the second namespace**.

Thatcher teaches the limitation by stating **evaluating correlation information that correlates objects in the first namespace with objects in the second namespace** (Thatcher col. 2 lines 30-39 and col. 8 lines 45-61 e.g. A target object in the first namespace is selected. If the target object has an association with the second namespace, the second namespace is accessed and at least a portion of the second namespace is determined. At least a portion of the second namespace is displayed in relation to the target object; when the user requests to expand the target 51A, at least a portion of the foreign namespaces 54 will be displayed in the user interface 57 relative to the target 51A.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of namespace, at the time of the present invention, having the teachings of Yellepeddy and Thatcher before him/her, to modify the namespace method of Thatcher, wherein the method would include teachings of Thatcher because that would have allowed the method to provide the capability for aggregating disparate namespaces, independent of the type of namespaces, wherein each namespace does not require intimate knowledge of the other namespaces (see Thatcher col. 2 lines4-7).

16. With respect to claim 4,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the correlation information comprises a persistent data store that associates central representations in the second namespace with external objects in other namespaces** (see Yellepeddy [0064], where These multiple local tables are then combined to created a joined table ("JT") by a table joining function (45)).

17. With respect to claim 5,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the association comprises a link between a unique identifier for each central representation in the second namespace and unique identifies for each external object** (see Yellepeddy [0047], where a metadirectory: (c) it is able to flow a pointer such as an LDAP Universal Resource Locator ("IURL") to the information that a metadirectory must resolve for the metadirectory user).

18. With respect to claim 6,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the unique identifier comprises a globally unique identifier** (see Yellepeddy [0047], where a metadirectory: (c) it is able to flow a pointer such as an LDAP Universal Resource Locator ("IURL") to the information that a metadirectory must resolve for the metadirectory user).

19. With respect to claim 7,

Yellepeddy further discloses **wherein the persistent data store comprises a table** (see Yellepeddy [0064], where These multiple local tables are then combined to created a joined table ("JT") by a table joining function (45)).

20. With respect to claim 9,

Thatcher further discloses **wherein each object comprises an entity** (Thatcher Fig. 1 e.g. User Object).

21. With respect to claim 10,

Thatcher further discloses **wherein each entity comprises a unique identifier that is immutable and a name** (Thatcher Fig. 1 e.g. User Object: Given Name, Last Name, Login Name).

22. With respect to claim 11,

Thatcher further discloses **wherein the name is mutable** (Thatcher Fig. 1 e.g. User Object: Login Name).

23. Concerning claims 15, 16 and 18,

The limitations therein have substantially the same scope as claims 4-6, 10, and 11. Therefore claims 15, 16 and 18 are rejected for at least the same reasons as claims 4-6, 10, and 11.

24. Concerning claims 27-29,

The limitations therein have substantially the same scope as claims 3, 5-6 and 10 because claims 27-29 are computer-readable medium claims for implementing those methods of claims 3, 5-6 and 10. Therefore claims 27-29 are rejected for at least the same reasons as claims 3, 5-6 and 10.

Response to Argument

25. On pages 10-12, Applicant argues that:

Yellepeddy Fails to Anticipate Claims 1,2, 8, 13, 19, 20 and 26

[0005] Claims 1, 2, 8, 13, 19, 20 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yellepeddy. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Moreover, claims 8 and 19 are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Independent Claims 1 and 26

[0006] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 26 is moot. Claims 1 and 26 are amended to include a similar feature previously recited in dependent claim 8, and now recite in part, "wherein the second namespace includes a metadirectory that includes all data from each of its associated namespaces."

[0007] In the rejection of claim 8, the Office states that Yellepeddy discloses that "the second namespace comprises a metadirectory," citing Paragraph [0060]. Office Action page 7. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that Yellepeddy does not disclose "a metadirectory" as presently recited in claims 1 and 26, at least because Yellepeddy is directed toward preventing cluttering of the metadirectory, as discussed in Yellepeddy Paragraph [0060], reproduced for convenience (with emphasis):

The basic join operation performed by the metadirectory (20) merges selected data items from each of these data sources to create an entry (21) in a local table for Mr. Kent. **Objects from data sources which are not merged or joined are filtered. This prevents cluttering the metadirectory with data items which are not commonly needed from the unified view of the metadirectory.** For example, the surname, first name, title, work telephone number and department from the HR database may be exported to the metadirectory, **filtering out the other attributes (employee number, date of hire, etc.).** Additionally, the user objects from the Novellware bindary may be exported to the metadirectory, while filtering out the routing tables for Mr. Kent.

[0008] Rather, the join operation in Yellepeddy is directed towards filtering out any data items that are not "commonly needed from the unified view of the metadirectory." For example, since an employee number and the date of hire are not data items needed in other databases, there is no reason to clutter the metadirectory, according to Yellepeddy.

[0009] Thus, Yellepeddy fails to disclose that "the second namespace includes a metadirectory that includes all data from each of its associated namespaces," as presently recited in claims 1 and 26. Instead, Yellepeddy teaches away from such a feature because Yellepeddy describes merging only the necessary, common data items in a metadirectory.

[0010] Consequently, Yellepeddy does not disclose all of the elements and features of these claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Yellepeddy does not anticipate these claims, and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn. Moreover, it would not have been obvious to modify Yellepeddy to include that "the second namespace includes a metadirectory that includes all data from each of its associated namespaces," since doing so would be contrary to the teachings of Yellepeddy.

Examiner disagrees because:

Yellepeddy describes "Turning to FIG. 1, the metadirectory architecture (1) according to the preferred embodiment is shown. The Joiner (10) communicates with connected data sources ("DS"), such as databases (11, 16), either directly or through an Agent (12, 15, 17). It merges entries of the same object type from different data

Art Unit: 2166

sources together, such as text files (18), records in a database (16, 11), networked data storage items (13), or other remotely accessible data stores, such as LDAP directories (14, 19). The Joiner (10) keeps a copy of the joined data from each data source in a relational database, preferably in a DB2 database. Each object type for each data store is contained in a local table ("LT") (100). As such, the advantages of the Joiner of the preferred embodiment include: (b) all resources in an organization are represented by a Join" (see Yellepeddy [0051] – [0052], [0055], [0057] and Fig. 1).

The disclosures reasonably describe the argued limitation of "the second namespace includes a metadirectory (e.g. metadirectory architecture (1) in Fig. 1) that includes all data (e.g. each object type. As referring to the instant application specification Fig. 4 "Name, GUID, Full Name, Salary, E-Mail Address, Manager") from each of its associated namespaces (e.g. for each data store – text files 18, database 16, network data storage 14 and LDAP directories 14 & 19)".

Further, as described in Yellepeddy [0043] "One particular advantage of the present invention allows administrators to specify rules for criteria for matching objects from one directory to another, rules for attribute and object ownership, and rules for filtering attributes. For example, a rule may be established for a component in a metadirectory which contains employee salary information to prohibit that information from being replicated or copied into other directories, files or databases", the filtering is an option only if administrators specify.

26. On page 12, the arguments of claim 2 are directed to the similar argument of claim 1 which has been addressed above.

27. On pages 13-14, the arguments of claim 13 are directed to the similar argument of claim 1 which has been addressed above.
28. On page 14, the arguments of claim 20 are directed to the similar argument of claim 1 which has been addressed above.
29. On pages 14-15, the arguments of claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, and 27-29 are directed to the similar argument of claim 1 which has been addressed above.

Conclusion

30. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SyLing Yen whose telephone number is 571-270-1306.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached at 571-272-3978. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

SyLing Yen
Examiner
Art Unit 2166

/SyLing Yen/

Examiner, Art Unit 2166

October 5, 2010